DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 093 218 HE 005 658

AUTHOR Brown, David G.
TITLE The Supreme Role of Faculty in Planning: Why and How? Planning for Higher Education. Vol. 3; No. 3; June 1974.
INSTITUTION Society for Coll. and Univ. Planning, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE Jun 74
NOTE 5p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.50 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Administrative Personnel; *Administrator Role; *Educational Administration; *Educational Planning; Faculty; *Higher Education; *Teacher Participation; Teacher Role
IDENTIFIERS *Academic Planning Officer

ABSTRACT

The most distinctive organizational characteristic of universities is their bottom-heavy authority, the decentralized decisionmaking, and their strong reliance upon the judgments of individual faculty. The preservation of this type of structure is essential to the efficient and effective pursuit of the university's basic mission: to facilitate discovery and personal growth. The actions of virtually all universities reflect a strong conviction that planning should be dominated by similarly trained individuals in department-like groups and that the administration should facilitate this planning by: motivating faculty to plan for themselves; liberating faculty from habitual/traditional modes of thought; being a resource/consultant person; and providing structures and formats that allow an institution to revise and redirect its plans with minimum effort. As such, the author presents ideas to help the academic planning person become the motivator, liberator, resource person, and coordinator necessary for true faculty participation. (Author/PG)

planning for higher education

Vol. 3, No. 3: 2/6 June 1974

The Supreme Role of Faculty in Planning: Why and How?

The development of an open-ended list of ways in which to increase the effective participation of faculty in university planning efforts was the goal set by David G. Brown, provost of Miami University, Oxford, Ohio, in his address to the SCUP/ADAPT workshop, "More For Less: Academic Planning *With* Faculty *Without* New Dollars." The complete proceedings of the workshop, which was held April 17-19, 1974 at the Nordic Hills Conference Center near Chicago, will be published this fall as a cooperative venture of the Society and Educational Testing Service.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Society for College
& Univ. Planning
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

Planning *for* faculty or *about* faculty or even *with* faculty is easier, more visible, more efficient than planning *by* faculty; but it is also less effective, often sterile, usually unimplemented, and sometimes downright harmful. This conviction rests primarily upon two premises, the first relating to "what is precious, unique, and distinctive about the university as contrasted to other institutions of society" and the second relating to the means by which the comparative advantage of universities may be realized.

Beginning with the two premises, I shall go on to describe the role of the Academic Planning Officer (who may well be the President or the Chief Academic Officer in smaller institutions) as four-fold:

- to motivate faculty to plan themselves
- to liberate faculty from traditional/habitual modes of thought
- to be a resource person and consultant
- to provide structures and organizational formats that allow an institution, or part of an institution, to revise and redirect its plans with minimum effort.

As each of these four roles is identified I shall begin lists of possible "ways to implement" each role. And finally, since the conference title is "Planning *With* Faculty *Without* New Dollars", I shall begin a list of ways to find new dollars from old allocations. Now to the premises.

First Premise: Decentralized Structure

The most distinctive organizational characteristic of universities is their *bottom*-heavy authority, their *de*centralized decision-making, their strong reliance upon the judgments of individual faculty. The preservation of this type of structure is essential to the efficient and effective pursuit of the university's basic mission: to facilitate discovery and personal growth. The university is a specialized institution in society. It is structured to complete successfully tasks that are essentially non-repetitive, and often not clearly definable.

The university is not at all good at implementing a narrowly defined goal. Here I'll bet with business corporations, labor unions, governmental agencies. In an hierarchial organization it is assumed that the higher a person is on the pyramid, the better his ability to judge, either because his abilities have been proven at a lower level, because he has more information and a broader perspective, or because he has more experience. *The university is one of the very few organizations in society that accepts the chaos that naturally grows out of the belief that the judgment of the people "on the firing line" (the faculty) is superior to the judgment of top management.*

Universities pursue endeavors that benefit from a bottom-heavy authority structure. These tasks tend to be very personal, such as assisting a particular individual to grow (as in a university) or keeping an individual

person in good health (as in a hospital, where the doctors' authority exceeds the authority of the hospital's top management). These tasks tend to be very deviant, such as a researcher pursuing a byway that everyone else believes to be unproductive, and such as a philosopher moralizing on an issue that places the majority in a bad light. As is the case in any properly functioning competitive society, historical circumstance has allocated to the university the responsibility for performing those tasks that are best performed in a highly decentralized organization.

The planning process adopted by a university must enhance bottom-heavy authority structure. To adopt a centralized planning strategy is to destroy what is precious in a university, to annihilate an institutional alternative in society, to eliminate the university's one comparative advantage, to doom universities as we know them today to extinction.

Second Premise: Participatory Planning

Planning decisions cannot and should not be separated from today decisions, for all decisions have consequences for tomorrow. Planning must be an integral part of an institution's life, and be dominated by the people who make decisions for today. An independent planning office is appropriate only if it takes the most subservient role.

At the authoritative end of the spectrum of stereotypic planners is the author of the long-range plan. He writes the plan. His full time and only job is to envision, anticipate, and implement the future. Although his ideas must be formally ratified by the official decision maker such as the president, the ratification is perfunctory and the plan is not of the president but of the planner. Such a planning process is feasible and perhaps desirable when a single objective-mission is widely accepted and when the planner is able to develop a knowledge-expertise roughly comparable to the individuals throughout the organization.

At the participatory end is the facilitator and technical advisor, a resource person. He has no authority. His planning role is defined by others coming to him. Others determine the objective of their planning and ask for advice on how their plans might be implemented. In this model the planner is an extremely valuable person who increases the productivity and successfulness of others as they plan.

My second premise is that the participatory planner is the only one acceptable within the academic community of a university. The tradition of faculty senates and the reality of the wide distribution of highly specialized expertise mean that, except in the most authoritarian universities, another type of planner will be drafting documents that are never adopted. The actions of virtually all universities reflect a strong conviction that planning should be dominated by similarly trained individuals in department-like groups and that the administration should facilitate rather than determine plans.

We know how to plan when an organization accepts the centralized authority of the top figure in hierarchy. The challenge is to determine ways in which individual institutions can plan when the primary authority rests somewhere in the middle of the hierarchy. We thus start with the premise that planning must be *with* the faculty and *by* the faculty—not *for* the faculty.

Universities should be dominated by faculty and students. Administrative planning by grand scheme is ineffective and dysfunctional except in those colleges and universities intending radical change. For reasons educational and political, planning must be incremental, decentralized, and a primary responsibility of each professor.

In my hypothetical university, the person titled planning officer is a facilitator, a catalyst, a resource person, an advocate of planning, a collator and coordinator of a total statement of aspirations and firm intents. He is not the author of a plan, an imposer of structure. He is in the model of a department chairman, dean, or provost who proceeds more through the power of persuasion and the quality of his ideas than through the authority of his position.

Planner as Motivator

Like all of us, faculty tend to put off "thinking about the long range" in order to respond to the crisis of the moment. Every planning officer must take positive steps to motivate faculty to plan. Faculty must be imbued with the deep conviction that planning is critical, that planning without faculty is inferior, and that planning with new dollars is truly unrealistic. Let me begin several lists of "how to's" by suggesting ways the planning facilitator may motivate faculty.

(1) Persuade faculty that "others cannot do it for them." Consider articulating my two premises. Circulate a "grand scheme" developed without faculty involvement from another university, preferably nearby and comparable, and frighten faculty into action.

(2) Highlight local exemplars of good planning. Honor the good planner by providing wide distribution to the effort. Share local anecdotes about the desirable consequences of a particular planning effort.

(3) Circulate examples of planning efforts that do not require prodigious quantities of time. Raise the confidence of the faculty member in his ability to plan by highlighting the planning he is

Planning for Higher Education Vol. 3, No. 3: 2/6 June 1974 © Society for College and University Planning, 616 West 114th Street, New York, New York 10025. Published in cooperation with Educational Facilities Laboratories, 477 Madison Avenue, New York, New York 10022. This article edited by Lawrence F. Kramer.

already doing. The avoidance of professional planning jargon helps.

(4) Make visible the planning efforts of top administrative officials.

(5) Send faculty leaders to off-campus seminars regarding the value of faculty planning, such as this seminar. Circulate this paper, and others like it. Invite a consultant to speak to the value of planning at the regular departmental and college meetings of faculty, and perhaps arrange in advance for a local panel of faculty to comment on the remarks.

(6) Respond to planning reports. How can we in good conscience plead for faculty to pour precious energy into planning when so many faculty planning reports end in file drawers? Faculty will give time and effort only to the extent that there are visible effects.

(7) Share financial data. Faculty will not plan within realistic constraints until convinced that resources are limited, that there is no pot of gold in overspending on athletics or under fund raising.

(8) Refuse to plan for faculty. Some faculty will let a staff planner do it for them. Don't.

(9) Designate community-wide times for planning. How about all-campus planning week? Three planning days prior to the beginning of classes? Planning Wednesdays?

(10) Convene a weekly meeting of individuals interested in faculty planning, so that these faculty can reinforce each others' commitments and share information.

(11) Pay a one time only special achievement bonus of (say) $300 to the 10% of the faculty who are judged by a committee to be doing the finest job, or making the most effort, in planning. Award several departments supplemental funds, to be spent at the discretion of the departmental faculty, as a prize for department-wide planning efforts.

(12) Establish a special fund for buying "realeased time" to plan from a department. For example, the planner might be awarded a budget that would allow him to hire a part time instructor to replace a faculty member who is mutually designated by the department and the planning officer to develop a departmental plan.

(13) Assign faculty planners a special title, such as Professor *and* Fellow in the Institute of Planning. Allow the special title to buy access to special clerical support and a new colleague group.

(14) Initiate a "summer award" (e.g. $1000 stipends). Consider a faculty committee or the planning officer assigning these awards to those who submit the most promising planning proposals.

(15) Regularize the Annual Review. At review time, ask each faculty member to project the objectives to be accomplished during the upcoming year and, if desired, subsequent years. By paying attention to these statements during the conference and referring to the quality of the statements when arguing for salary increment and promotion, the chairman can impress their significance and the value he assigns to them.

Planner as Liberator of Ideas

With faculty, and all other planners, a primary challenge is to enable thinking beyond a mere extrapolation of present trends. If an institution is to involve its entire faculty and staff in thinking about the future, as a second primary role, the planner-facilitator must encourage the breaking of habitual thinking patterns. To facilitate "breaking habitual thinking" there are at least three strategies. *The first is to provide access to new information by:*

(16) Providing free subscriptions to periodicals (for example The Chronicle of Higher Education.)

(17) Highlighting selected journal articles through free distribution.

(18) Forming luncheon discussion groups.

(19) Sponsoring faculty colloquia for staff whereby capsulized presentations of new thoughts and seldom-seen activities can be made available to faculty (for example, a short course on programming).

(20) Encouraging faculty to visit the classes of colleagues.

(21) Facilitating the auditing of courses among faculty.

(22) Incorporating thoughts about the future in the President's annual address to the faculty.

(23) Circulating among faculty offices several of the leading publications from the futurology literature.

(24) Initiating a special newsletter on teaching innovations and planning techniques.

(25) Videotaping a successful teaching improvement.

(26) Charging a group of younger faculty with the special responsibility to inform their colleagues of the most recent pedagogical and research-methodology developments.

(27) Publishing a faculty vita book to make faculty aware who on their home campus has interests similar to their own.

As a second strategy, traditional thinking patterns may be challenged by presenting new tasks for the purpose of exposure, specifically by:

(28) Providing an administrative assignment for a faculty member during the summer.

(29) Team teaching a course.

(30) Switching course teaching assignments.

(31) Rotating committee assignments.

As a third stragegy, an aggressive administration can encourage the development of new environments by:

(32) Routinely approving leaves of absence without pay.

(33) Continuing the salary of its faculty member who is temporarily assigned to another campus if the other campus is willing to exchange a faculty member without "charge."
(34) Paying the moving and dislocation costs of faculty exchanges among universities.
(35) Negotiating faculty exchanges with foreign universities.
(36) Informing and coaching faculty regarding competition for Fulbrights and other national awards.
(37) Joining the several national faculty information exchanges.
(38) Encouraging faculty in different departments to switch teaching loads.
(39) Bringing distinguished speakers to campus.
(40) Initiating artist-in-residence or executive-in-residence programs.
(41) Sponsoring interdisciplinary colloquia within the campus.
(42) Urging faculty to attend different conferences rather than returning to the same conference year after year.
(43) Forming advisory committees of alumni in each disciplinary-department grouping.
(44) Encouraging some faculty to office for one year only within another department.
(45) Focussing the sabbatical time via the requirement of a report at the end of the sabbatical that indicates what a faculty member thinks he or she should do differently in light of the likely future developments in the field.
(46) Funding "look-see" trips to other campuses where there are on-going experiments.
(47) Encouraging the faculty to locate alternative summer employment in industry or at another university.
(48) Hiring outside consultants to visit with local faculty.

By now I hope you are convinced that there are many procedures by which the Planning Officer can break habitual thinking through faculty development. At this very moment there is a great deal of interest by foundations and the government, as well as institutions themselves, in the concept of faculty development and environment change. Many of you I am sure will have much to add to my beginning list.

Planner as Resource Person

The same faculty who are superbly prepared to anticipate future trends and needs in subject matter disciplines are typically woefully uneducated about planning and implementation methodologies. They know, for example, that a new theory of aerodynamics will revolutionize their discipline but they do not know how to translate this impact into concrete futures.

Here the facilitating planner can assume the very valuable role of resource person, of special consultant. For the majority of faculty who will not and should not take the time to become specialized in planning procedures and techniques, the availability of specialized advice can be invaluable. The planner fulfilling this role as resource might:

(49) Conduct special in-house seminars on planning techniques.
(50) Maintain a file of teaching and research methodology innovations by discipline, including innovations such as the Keller Plan.
(51) Make available "canned" computer programs that can be used to evaluate the success or failure of various instructional techniques.
(52) Survey faculty, students, and alumni regarding their educational experiences through a routine questionnaire.
(53) Design and maintain a general data system used in planning and evaluating various endeavors.
(54) Develop diaries of departmental planning procedures, and circulate them.
(55) Circulate an annual list of printed materials available.
(56) Maintain an up-to-date file of all planning efforts within the university.
(57) Make presentations at department meetings.
(58) Attend seminars and read widely.
(59) Initiate planning conversations with influential faculty leaders.
(60) Assist departmental shelf studies by suggesting a methodological format and overseeing implementation.

Planner as Coordinator

Up to now I have advocated a totally decentralized approach to planning. But total decentralization may well lead to chaos, to a series of nonreconcilable plans based on non-comparable assumptions and phrased in different format and language. It is the obligation of the planning officer to provide a framework and a vocabulary within which all faculty can plan. It is the obligation of the planning officer to articulate some basic parameters upon which projections by faculty can be based.

Because faculty planning equations are unsolvable when too many variables are unknown, the planning officer in close consultation with the faculty should postulate matters such as tuition rates, income levels, enrollment changes, building availablity. It is only then that attention can be meaningfully focussed by the faculty on the crucial elements of curriculum, learning methodologies, and the like.

Another equally important central responsibility of the planning officer is to provide the framework for all-university planning, both the big picture and the linkage among individual planning units. I have some very specific thoughts and suggestions regarding this general framework. My conviction is that the truly clairvoyant planner recognizes that the future is above all uncertain. The highest challenge for the university planner is to design a system for planning, a system that

allows the efficient pursuit of an objective in 1974 without preempting the possibility of pursuing with equal efficiency in 1977 a totally different objective. The challenge to the academic planner is to facilitate today's decisions while accounting for tomorrow's realities, without at the same time limiting tomorrow's opportunities.

The planning system should provide, first and foremost, flexibility and the ability to make a mid-course correction. Every plan is out-of-date before the ink is dry. Revision, reevaluation, rethinking, updating must be a built-in feature of every planning system, and it is the responsibility of the planning officer to assure this flexibility. Among the several general procedures a university may adopt to assure such reevaluation are the following:

(61) the looseleaf planning notebook.
(62) outside consultants.
(63) periodic ad hoc taskforces.

The now outworn concept of the 10-year masterplan may wisely be replaced by the looseleaf notebook. Within the notebook, where looseleaves are symbolic of planning flexibility, are contained the individual aspirations and plans of each department, each college, each sector of the university. At any time a unit may, at its own initiative, update its plan by simply replacing pages. The planning officer may, if desired, take responsibility for checking on the currency of plans, say every three years.

Outside consultants rarely have the right answers but they often ask the correct questions. The primary advantage of the outside consultant, whether viewing the program of a department within the university or the university as a whole, is the fresh perspective. In my judgment, no major decision should be made without the benefit of an outside consultant. Consultants add perspective, an element of disinterest, and an authenticity to plans. Always it is important to evaluate the relevance of the advice given in terms of the local circumstances.

The strategy of ad hoc planning task forces is to tap faculty and students active in the classroom for a one-shot planning effort that is university-wide. In this manner planning avoids bureaucratization. The university using this technique will appoint a blue ribbon group of faculty every two or three years. The groups will be asked to examine institutional direction, and to make recommendations on new directions. The excuse of the "biennium" may be the inauguration of a new president or his decade anniversary, a decennial accreditation review, a cost cutting squeeze, student concern as expressed in active protest, an investigation by the legislature, a report from an outside consultant, a charge to upgrade the general quality of effort. The excuse is not important. What is important is the concept that every 2 or 3 years there will be an all-institution review, assessment, and forward projection, each time with fresh personnel and prospective.

In order to adopt the new ideas generated by these flexible planning mechanisms, flexibility must be built into staffing arrangements, curriculum procedures, and the organizational structure. *A university committed to staffing flexibility may consider:*

(64) Longer probationary periods for faculty.
(65) Distributing information about tenure percentages and models that project upcoming percentages by departments.
(66) Positions that are explicitly temporary and not within the tenure track.
(67) Early retirement or partial retirement, preferably through special arrangements that minimize the individual financial consequences of early retirement.
(68) Adjunct and visiting professorships.
(69) Part-time professorships and emergency funding for last minute needs.
(70) Periodic review of all administrative positions including the position of academic planner.

Curricular flexibility may be provided by:

(71) Allowing any course to be taught under an experimental number on a one-time basis.
(72) Requiring each department to purge 10% of its courses each year.
(73) Providing that no course may be taught for more than 5 consecutive years.
(74) Building in procedures that call for the review of the total curriculum every three to five years.
(75) Switching academic calendars periodically.

Organizational flexibility may be provided by:

(76) Forming temporary institutes that may not exist for more than five years.
(77) Merging departments so that disciplinary specialists can determine to make their own trade-offs.
(78) Making joint appointments across several departments.
(79) Founding new schools and colleges.
(80) Funding an Institute for Teaching Innovation and Institutional Vitality.

Mine is the old-fashioned idea that modern management methodologies should be used toward increasing the decision effectiveness of decentralized and loosely coordinated planning. The single-minded university mimics other societal institutions such as business corporations. The participatory university mimics other societal institutions such as city governments and labor unions. The decentralized university, with effective planning responsibility at the bottom of the "hierarchy," is truly distinctive. The unique, decentralized university is the one most worth preserving. Here the risk may be chaos and ineffiency but it is not misguided purpose and political takeover.

David G. Brown

Special Note: Provost Brown would very much like to expand his list of suggestions of ways to motivate faculty to participate in planning efforts. He urges readers of *Planning for Higher Education* to send suggestions to him, for his use in future presentations, and for possible inclusion in a future issue of *Planning*.